## MONTHLY WEATHER REVIEW.

## A COMPARISON OF TWO TYPES OF EVAPORATION PANS.1

By G. A. LOVELAND, Meteorologist.

[Weather Bureau Office, Lincoln, Nebr., Jan. 26, 1921.]

SYNOPSIS

The Briggs pan has a relatively large amount of water in a tank set in the ground with the top of the tank near the surface of the ground. The Weather Bureau tank has much less water and is placed all above the ground. The Weather Bureau tank evaporates from 30 per cent to nearly 50 per cent more water than the Briggs pan. The difference seems to depend more on the air temperature than on any other weather element. The tables give these differences in detail.

In the spring of 1917, a standard Weather Bureau evaporation pan was installed at the Agricultural experiment farm, Lincoln, Nebr. As this pan differed somewhat from the pan previously used to measure evaporation at the farm and from others in the State it seemed best to test the two types of pans by a series of observations with the two pans as nearly as possible similarly exposed to the weather.

The standard Weather Bureau pan is round, 4 feet in diameter and 10 inches deep. It was placed about 4 inches above the ground on wooden supports with air touching the sides and bottom. The water was kept

about 4 inches below the top of the pan.

The other, or Briggs type of pan, is 7½ feet in diameter and 2 feet deep. It was set in the ordinary loess soil of the region, surrounded by grass. The top of the pan was flush with the ground. The water was kept as near as possible 4 inches below the top of the pan.

The tables give the monthly values of evaporation for the past four summers with some other related data, together with the differences in the monthly amounts and the percentage this difference is of the amount of evapor-

ation in the Briggs pan.

The temperature and rainfall records were kept from standard instruments properly exposed near the pans. The anemometer, from which the wind velocity records were taken, was placed near the rim of the Weather Bureau pan, with the cups 5 inches above the top, which made them 19 inches above the Briggs pan. The relative humidity was taken from the records of the Lincoln station located about 3 miles distant.

It is realized that a 4-vear record is too short to determine the laws controlling the differences in the readings, but some facts can be brought out that are interesting and valuable. The Weather Bureau pan consistently evaporated the most water with a large percentage of increase which varied considerably in different months. With three years' record in May and September and four years in the other months on the average for the season the Weather Bureau pan evaporated 43 per cent more than the Briggs pan—that is, the amount of evaporation measured in the Briggs pan multiplied by 1.43 would yield very approximately the amount that would be recorded in a Weather Bureau pan. On the other hand, the amount measured in a Weather Bureau pan multiplied by 0.70 would give the measurements of the Briggs pan.<sup>2</sup>

This short record seems to demonstrate the necessity of care in using the measurements from the two pans and the advisability of adopting as rapidly as possible the standard pan for all measurements of evaporation.

The reason for the larger evaporation of the Weather Bureau pan is due to the effect of the various and varying meteorological elements on the two types of pans. The smaller pan with the surface of the water somewhat higher and so more exposed to air movement and changes in temperature would result in a greater evaporation.

Table 1.—Comparison of evaporation from Briggs and Weather Bureau pans.

	Year.	Evaporation.				Temperature.			-		
Month.		Briggs pan.	Weath- er Bu- reau pan.	Dif- fer- ence.	Dif- fer- euce.		Mean mini- mum.		Wind (miles per hour).	Hu- mid- ity.	Pre- cipi- ta- tion.
	(1917	Inches. 5, 155	Inches.	Inches. 0. 551		• F.	° F.	° F.	. 1	P. ct. 64	Inche 4.
fay	1918	7. 108	5. 706 9. 155	2.047	0. 107 . 288	80	54	67	5.1 6.9	60	3.6
•	1919	3. 281	6.049 5.508	2.227	679	70 71	49 50	59 61	3. 2 3. 9	68 72	1. 4 5.
								<del></del> -			
	Sums	15. 544	26.418	4. 825		<u> </u>					<u> </u>
	Average.	5, 181	6.603	1.608	. 358				4.8	66	
	(1917	6.915	9. 273	2.358	0. 341	80	58	69	4.2	63	6.
June	1918	7.452	10. 561	3, 109	417	90	63	76	3.8	59	2. 6.
	1919	4, 912 6, 264	7. 045 8. 277	2, 133 2, 013	.434	81 83	62 62	71 72	2.8 3.5	75 62	6. 2.
	Sums	25. 543	35, 156	9. 613	1				1		
	Average.	6.386	S. 789	2, 403	.378	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	3.6	65	
	1	1			1.5.5	1		1			
	(1917	7. 455	10. 523	3.068	0.412	91	64	77	3.2	59	0. 2.
uly	11918	6, 861 7, 995	10. 138 11. 700	3. 277 3. 705	.478	90 94	65 68	77 81	3.8 3.0	59 59	2. 0.
	1920	6.063	8.641	2.578	. 425	88	63	76	2.1	62	3.
	Sums	28, 374	41.002	12.628							
	Average.	7.094	10. 250	3. 157	. 411				3.0	60	
	·	<u>'</u>	<del></del>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<del>'</del>	<u>'                                    </u>		<u>'                                    </u>	<u></u> -	<u> </u>
	[1917	5. 351	7. 528	2.177	0.407	85	58	71	2.6	70	3.
ug	J1918	7. 567 6. 083	11. 548 9. 101	3.981 3.018	. 526	95 86	67 62	81 74	4.2 2.8	57 66	0. 3.
	13 1010		9, 101	0.010			1 02				9.
	1919 1920	4.683	6. 189	1.506	. 322	83	59	71	1.1	67	4.
			6. 189 34. 366	1.506			59		1.1		4.
	[1920	4. 683	6, 189				59		2.7		4.
	(1920 Sums	4. 683 23. 684	6, 189 34, 366	10.682			59		1.1	67	4.
	(1920   Sums   Average .	4. 683 23. 684 5. 921	6. 189 34. 366 8. 592 5. 408	10. 682 2. 670	.438	79	54	66	2.7	65	2
	Sums Average.	4. 683 23. 684 5. 921 4. 761 4. 791	6. 189 34. 366 8. 592 5. 408 7. 467 7, 150	10. 682 2. 670 2. 706 2. 359	. 438 0. 568 . 492	79 73 82	54 47 59	66 60 70	2.7 2.7 3.2 4.4 3.7	67 65 72 59 67	2. 1. 5.
	Sums Average.	4. 683 23. 684 5. 921	6. 189 34. 366 8. 592 5. 408 7. 467	10. 682 2. 670	. 438 0. 568 . 492	83	54 47	66	2.7	67 65 72 59	2.1.5.
	Sums Average.	4. 683 23. 684 5. 921 4. 761 4. 791	6. 189 34. 366 8. 592 5. 408 7. 467 7, 150	10. 682 2. 670 2. 706 2. 359	. 438 0. 568 . 492	79 73 82	54 47 59	66 60 70	2.7 2.7 3.2 4.4 3.7	67 65 72 59 67	2.1.5.
	[1920	4. 683 23. 684 5. 921 4. 761 4. 791 4. 283	6. 189 34. 366 8. 592 5. 408 7. 467 7. 150 6. 425	10. 682 2. 670 2. 706 2. 359 2. 142	. 438 0. 568 . 492 . 500	79 73 82	54 47 59	66 60 70	2.7 2.7 3.2 4.4 3.7	67 65 72 59 67	2. 1. 5.
	1920	4. 683 23. 684 5. 921 4. 761 4. 791 4. 283 13. 835 4. 612	6. 189 34. 366 8. 592 5. 408 7. 467 7. 150 6. 425 26. 450 6. 612	2. 706 2. 359 2. 142 7. 207 2. 402	. 438 0. 568 . 492 . 500	79 73 82 82	54 47 59 55	66 60 70 68	3.2 4.4 3.7 2.7 3.5	67 65 72 59 67 68 	2.1.5.1.
Sept	(1920   Sums   Average     (1917   1918   1919   1920   Sums   Average     (1917   1918   1918   1918	4. 683 23. 684 5. 921 4. 761 4. 791 4. 283 13. 835 4. 612	6. 189 34. 366 8. 592 5. 408 7. 467 7. 150 6. 425 26. 450 6. 612	10. 682 2. 670 2. 706 2. 359 2. 142 7. 207 2. 402	. 322 	79 73 82 82	54 47 59 55	66 60 70 68	3.2 4.4 3.7 2.7 3.5	67 65 72 59 67 68	2. 1. 5. 1.
Sept	1920   Sums   Average	4. 683 23. 684 5. 921 4. 761 4. 791 4. 283 13. 835 4. 612	6. 189 34. 366 8. 592 5. 408 7. 467 7. 150 6. 425 26. 450 6. 612	10. 682 2. 670 2. 706 2. 359 2. 142 7. 207 2. 402	0. 568 . 492 . 500	79 73 82 82	54 47 59 55	66 60 70 68	3. 2 4. 4 3. 5 3. 5	67 65 72 59 67 68 66	2.1.5.1.
Sept	1920   Sums   Average	4. 683 23. 684 5. 921 4. 761 4. 791 4. 283 13. 835 4. 612 4. 296 2. 877 2. 105	6. 189 34. 366 8. 592 5. 408 7. 467 7. 150 6. 425 26. 450 6. 612 5. 574 4. 765 2. 616	10. 682 2. 670 2. 706 2. 359 2. 142 7. 207 2. 402 1. 288 1. 888 0. 511	. 322 . 438 . 0. 568 . 492 . 500 	79 73 82 82 82 82 82 86 60	54 47 59 55 	66 60 70 68	3.2 4.4 3.7 2.7 3.5	67 65 72 59 67 68 66	2. 1. 5. 1. 1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The percentage this difference is of the amount of the evaporation in the Briggs pan.

¹ Presented before American Meterological Society at Chicago, Dec. 29, 1920, ² This ratio of Weather Bureau pan to Briggs pan agrees very closely with theory, as is shown by a calculation based upon the results of Jefferies, that the rate of total evaporation from surfaces of the same shape and same orientation to the wind are to each other as the three-quarter powers of their respective areas. Such a calculation shows that the ratio of Weather Bureau pan to Briggs pan should be 0.67. Thus allowing for the effect of the difference of exposure, which, as the author shows, should cause the Weather Bureau pan to evaporate at a slightly greater rate than the Briggs, it appears that the agreement of these observations with theory is very good.— W. J. H.